

REMARKS

The Final Office Action mailed on July 12, 2007 has been reviewed, along with the art cited. Claims 14-45 are pending in this application.

Response to Applicant's Previous Arguments

The Office Action indicated that the Arguments set forth in the Applicant's response filed on 4/24/2007 were considered but deemed not persuasive. Specifically, the Office Action indicates that the previous response did not set forth arguments responsive to the rejections. This is not the case. The response filed on 4/24/2007 clearly set forth arguments to the outstanding rejections. Indeed, a check of Private PAIR by the undersigned on 9/10/2007 shows that the 4/24/2007 response for the present application includes arguments to the outstanding rejections that are not addressed in any way the Office Action. Applicant respectfully requests that the arguments set forth in the 4/24/2007 response be considered. Substantially the same arguments set forth in the 4/24/2007 response are set forth below for the convenience of the Examiner.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 14-21 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Cohen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,821,510). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 14 of the present application recites, in relevant part, "a processor coupled to *the first and second* communication mediums, the processor coordinating the communication of the connection information signals via the second communication medium and acquisition of connection information with regard to the cross-connected termination elements." (emphasis added).

With respect to claim 14, the Office Action took the position that processor 17 in Fig. 1A of Cohen discloses "a processor coupled to the first and second communication mediums." The Office Action also took the position that "a jumper 8 in Fig. 4" teaches "a first communication medium communicatively coupling cross-connected termination

elements of the plurality of termination elements.” However, nothing in Cohen teaches or suggests that processor 17 in Fig. 1A is coupled to the jumper 8 in any way.

Moreover, nowhere does Cohen teach “the processor coordinating the communication of the connection information signals via the second communication medium” as recited in claim 14. Indeed, Cohen relates to a fundamentally different approach in which a hand-held optical scanner is used to scan barcodes and display that information for a user.

Since Cohen does not teach or suggest all the features of claim 14, claim 14 is not anticipated by Cohen. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 16-21 and 23-28 depend from claim 14 and, thus, are allowable for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 14. In addition, claim 17 recites, in relevant part, “at least one patch cord *comprising a first* communication pathway *and a second* communication pathway.” The Office Action took the position that “the medium for transmitting optically encoded data 13” teaches the second communication pathway and that the “jumper 8” teaches the first communication pathway. However, nothing in Cohen teaches that “one patch cord” comprises both the “jumper 8” and “the medium for transmitting optically encoded data 13.”

Furthermore, claim 17 recites “the second communication pathway providing communication of connection information signals to and from the first and second termination elements.” The Office Action states that the medium for transmitting optically encoded data connects “a hand-held optical scanner and a receiver interface 16 in Fig. 1A.” Nothing in Cohen teaches the medium for transmitting optically encoded data communicates “connection information signals to and from the first and second termination elements.”

For the reasons stated above, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 16-21 and 23-38 be withdrawn.

In order to expedite prosecution, claim 33 was previously amended to recite, in relevant part, “communicating, via a second communication medium separate from the

first communication medium, connection information signals *between the cross-connected termination elements of the cross-connect system.*” The medium connecting a hand-held optical scanner and a receiver interface, as discussed in Cohen, does not teach or suggest communicating “communicating, via a second communication medium ..., connection information signals between the cross-connected termination elements of the cross-connect system.” Therefore, Cohen does not teach all the claimed features of amended claim 33, and Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 34-42 depend from claim 33 and, thus, are allowable for at least the reasons stated above with regards to claim 33. Applicant, therefore, requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 22, 29-32, and 43-45 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,821,510).

Claims 22 and 29-32 depend from claim 14 and, thus, at least the arguments set forth above with respect to claim 14 apply to these claims as well. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 43-45 depend from claim 33 and, thus at least the arguments set forth above with respect to claim 33 apply to these claims as well. Therefore, claims 43-45 are not obvious over Cohen. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

Serial No.: 10/017,653

Filing Date: 12/12/2001

Attorney Docket No. 100.407US02

Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR ELECTRONICALLY IDENTIFYING CONNECTIONS
OF A CROSS-CONNECT SYSTEM

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 14-45 are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 502432.

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2007-09-10

/Jon M. Powers/

Jon M. Powers

Reg. No. 43,868

Attorneys for Applicant
Fogg & Powers LLC
P.O. Box 581339
Minneapolis, MN 55458-1339
T – (612) 332-4720
F – (612) 332-4731